

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action is being submitted in response to the non-final Office Action mailed August 23, 2007. Claims 20-27 are pending in the Application.

Claims 20, 22, 25, and 26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. No. 5,504,609.

Claims 20, 23-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,677,618) in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,830).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,677,618) in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,830) and in further view of Shimokawa *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,973,953).

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,677,618) in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,830) and in further view of Giles (U.S. Pat. No. 5,633,741).

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,677,618) in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,830) and in further view of Froberg *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,625,722).

In response to these rejections, Claim 20 has been amended and Claims 21-22 have been cancelled to further clarify the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, without prejudice or disclaimer to continued examination on the merits. These amendments are fully supported in the Specification, Drawings, and Claims of the Application and no new matter has been added. Based upon the amendments and the arguments presented herein, reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 22, 25, and 26 – Rejection – Nonstatutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 20, 22, 25, and 26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. No. 5,504,609.

In response to this rejection, Applicants have amended independent Claim 20 to include all of the limitations previously recited in dependent Claim 21, and cancelled Claim 21. Claims 22, 25, and 26 each depend from Claim 20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 20, 23-24, and 26 as being unpatentable on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. No. 5,504,609 has been traversed, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 20, 23-24, and 26 - §103(a) Rejection – Haas *et al.*, Chraplyvy *et al.*

Claims 20, 23-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,677,618) in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,830).

In response to this rejection, Applicants have amended independent Claim 20 to include all of the limitations previously recited in dependent Claim 22, and cancelled Claim 22. Claims 23-24 and 26 each depend from Claim 20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 20, 23-24, and 26 as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* has been traversed, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 21 - §103(a) Rejection – Haas *et al.*, Chraplyvy *et al.*, Shimokawa *et al.*

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,677,618) in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,830) and in

further view of Shimokawa *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,973,953). Claim 21 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 25 - §103(a) Rejection – Haas *et al.*, Chraplyvy *et al.*, Giles

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,677,618) in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,830) and in further view of Giles (U.S. Pat. No. 5,633,741). Claim 25 depends from Claim 20. Therefore, the amendments with regard to Claim 20 apply with equal force here. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 25 as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* and in further view of Giles has been traversed, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 27 - §103(a) Rejection – Haas *et al.*, Chraplyvy *et al.*, Froberg *et al.*

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,677,618) in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,830) and in further view of Froberg *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,625,722). Claim 27 depends from Claim 20. Therefore, the amendments with regard to Claim 20 apply with equal force here. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 27 as being unpatentable over Haas *et al.* in view of Chraplyvy *et al.* and in further view of Froberg *et al.* has been traversed, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicants would like to thank Examiner for the attention and consideration accorded the present Application. Should Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place the Application in condition for allowance, Examiner is encouraged to contact undersigned Counsel at the telephone number, facsimile number, address, or email address provided below. It is not believed that any fees for additional claims, extensions of time, or the like are required beyond those that may otherwise be indicated in the documents accompanying this paper. However, if such additional fees are required, Examiner is encouraged to notify undersigned Counsel at Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2007

/s/ Christopher L. Bernard /
Christopher L. Bernard
Registration No.: 48,234

Lawrence A. Baratta Jr.
Registration No.: 59,553

Attorneys for Applicants

CLEMENTS | WALKER
1901 Roxborough Road, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211 USA
Telephone: 704.366.6642
Facsimile: 704.366.9744
cbernard@worldpatents.com